REMARKS

Claims 28-54 remain in this application. Claims 1-27 have been canceled. Claims 28-54 have been added.

Before responding to the Examiner's rejections in view of the prior art, a brief description of the present application is provided. The present invention provides a method and system that efficiently links information on and about an RFID tag to corresponding information located on the Internet. This link is provided for the purpose of supplementing the limited information that is stored in the RFID tag that has a limited storage capacity. The linked information may include all of the pertinent details without any concern for storage limitations as it is stored on a location on the Internet, having an enormous amount of storage capacity and capability. Thus, the present invention allows the RFID tag, through the corresponding location on the Internet, to provide detailed information (e.g., about a content of a package attached with the RFID tag) that cannot be conventionally stored on the RFID tag.

In one embodiment of the present invention, upon linking of the information between the RFID tag and the corresponding location on the Internet, the present invention allows for updating of network information from the location on the Internet with data stored in the RFID tag. The RFID tag may be located on a package and the data may describe a content of the package. In another embodiment, the present invention allows for updating of network information from the location on the Internet with first information stored in the RFID tag and second information regarding a location where the RFID tag is interrogated. In yet another embodiment, an operator of an RFID reader that interrogates the RFID tag does not have to take any action (e.g., physically entering current status information) to update the network information located on the Internet. In addition, the present invention allows for the automatic updating of network information regarding the package attached to the RFID tag and a location of where the RFID tag is interrogated.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-7, 9-19, 21-24, and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Reber. Claims 8, 20, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber in view of Kenney. In order to expedite allowance, the rejected claims are being canceled herein, without disclaimer and without prejudice. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that these rejections are now moot.

New Claims 28-54 have been added to clarify certain features of the subject matter being claimed. The limitations in these new claims are not disclosed in or suggested by the cited references (whether alone or in combination).

Reber merely discloses a substrate comprising a human-viewable image and machine readable data. The machine readable data is to be read by a reader. The reader is connected to a separate network access apparatus connected to the Internet. The human-viewable image is disclosed in Reber as an image displaying an electronic address (i.e., an Internet address or a URL) and the machine readable data allows linkage to the electronic address shown by the human-viewable image. The sole purpose of Reber is to resolve the problem of "address complexity" (i.e., "as the number of resources increases, newly-formed URLs become less intuitive and greater in length"). Thus, to resolve the problem of "address complexity" (i.e., the unintuitive URLs), Reber allows a web user to input the electronic address (i.e., the URL) by using the data reader to read in the machine-readable data (having the electronic address) rather than requiring the web user to type in the electronic address. See Col. 1, lines 10-48 and Col 2, lines 12-27, especially Col. 1, lines 39-42 and Col. 2, lines 19-21. Reber does not disclose or suggest linking of information on an RFID tag regarding a package attached to the RFID tag to a location on the Internet to supplement the limited storage capacity of the RFID tag with the enormous storage capability of the Internet. Reber further fails to disclose or suggest updating network information from a location on a computer network with data (regarding a package) stored in an RFID tag (located on the package). In addition, Reber does not disclose or suggest updating network

information from a location on a computer network with first information stored in an RFID tag and second information regarding a location of where the RFID tag is interrogated. By contrast, the present invention is directed to these information linking and updating concepts.

Kenney is directed to a system for measuring and storing parameters related to the manufacturing of printed circuit boards. The reference was cited by the Examiner merely for its disclosure of a code written in Java that is executed when a corresponding HTML web page displayed from a website. First of all, it should be noted that there is no teaching or suggestion to link the "simplified" Internet address entry system in Reber with the website in Kenney. The website in Kenney is only for viewing data/information related to manufacturing parameters monitored by the manufacturing system disclosed in Kenney. In addition, Kenney (either alone or in combination with Reber) fails to make up for the deficiencies of Reber discussed above.

These important differences between the present invention and the cited references show that the present invention is patently distinguishable from Reber and Kenney (whether alone or in combination). In addition, clear differences exist between the presently defined claims and the cited references. For example, with regard to independent Claim 28, the Applicant respectfully submits that this claim is patentable for at least the reason that it contains the limitations of:

> receiving first information stored in a memory of said RFID tag, said first information including an address identifying a location on a computer network corresponding to said RFID tag and **first data regarding said package;**
>
>   * * *
>
> accessing second information from said location on said computer network, **said second information including second data regarding said package**; and
>
> **updating said second information** from said location on the computer network **with said first data** regarding said package. (Emphasis in bold added).

Independent Claim 43 should be independently allowable because it recites the limitations of:

> an RFID tag located on a package having a memory containing at least an address identifying a location on a computer network and **first data regarding said package, wherein said memory has a limited storage capacity**; and

> an RFID reader connected to said client computer and being adapted to communicate with said RFID tag, said RFID reader providing said address recovered from said RFID tag to said client computer, said client computer thereby **communicating with said location for second data regarding said package** corresponding to said address through said application;

> **wherein said second data supplements said limited storage capacity on said RFID tag by providing a detailed description of said package.** (Emphasis in bold added).

Independent Claim 50 should also be independently allowable for containing the recitations of:

> receiving first information stored in a memory of said RFID tag, . . . ;

> * * *

> accessing second information from said location on said computer network; and

> **updating said second information from said location on said computer network with said first information and third information on a location of where said RFID tag is interrogated.** (Emphasis in bold added).

Claims 29-42, 44-49, and 51-54 should be allowable as depending from allowable respective base Claims 28, 43, and 50. These dependent claims should also be independently allowable because Reber and Kenney fail to disclose or suggest the

limitations in each of the dependent claims. For example, the references fail to disclose or suggest "wherein said RFID tag is interrogated by an RFID reader commanded by an operator of said RFID reader and wherein said second information is updated automatically without requiring any further interaction by said operator," as defined by Claim 29. Likewise, Reber and Kenney fail to disclose or suggest "wherein said second data comprises a detailed description of said package," as defined by Claim 30 or "wherein said RFID tag is located on a package, wherein said first information comprises a reference to a detailed description of a content of said package, and wherein said second information comprises said detailed description of said content of said package," as defined by Claim 54. Indeed, Reber and Kenney are totally unconcerned with presenting information from the Internet to supplement an RFID tag's limited storage capacity and/or updating of network information from a location on the Internet using the RFID tag.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 28-54 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested, and a timely Notice of Allowability is solicited. To the extent it would be helpful to placing this application in condition for allowance, the Applicant encourages the Examiner to contact the undersigned counsel and conduct a telephonic interview.

While the Applicant believes that no fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in the fees, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0639.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 23, 2003

Brian M. Berliner
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 34,549

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899
Telephone: (213) 430-6000

LA2:650824.2